



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and has been displaced by the series of additions extending from v. 10 to xiv. 23? Chapter xi. 1-9 would be better placed after ix. 1-7, and then xiv. 24-27 would follow with great propriety at the end of chapter x.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

Note on the Second Jeremiah.

THE list of passages assigned to this writer in the last paragraph of p. 296 requires some revision. I doubt whether in chapter xxx. we can regard the concluding verses (22-24) as an integral part of the text. I have already pointed out the unauthentic character of xxxi. 35-37. And I suspect that verses 38-40 belong to a later period than that of the Second Jeremiah. On the other hand, we must certainly ascribe to him xxxii. 37-42, and probably xxxiii. 6-9 in its original form, as well as verses 12-13. I take the opportunity of adding to my list xvi. 14, 15; i. 33, 34; and li. 5. This is as far as I can trace with confidence what I may call the secondary text in chapters l., li. To the same hand with the primary text of the prophecy against Babylon, I would ascribe chapter iv. 23-26, comparing both with Isa. xiii. 2-13. Indeed all three may perhaps be the work of one writer, *circa* B.C. 536. But I hope to return to this subject on a future occasion.

G. H. SKIPWITH.

A Note on Inspiration.¹

THIS note is not intended to be in any sense a review of Dr. Sanday's book. Such a review should be attempted by nobody who is not equally at home in the New Testament as in the Old, and in the history of the Canon as in the criticism of the text. I can only recommend that the book should be read by everybody at all interested in the subjects with which it deals. It may not be a final book; its mediatising point of view is probably not fully satisfactory. But for that very reason people on either side of the *via media* in which the author walks would do well to study it carefully. The very orthodox will see from it that criticism may be thorough, and yet reverent, and that a large measure of it

¹ "Inspiration." By the Rev. Professor Sanday, D.D.; being the Bampton Lectures for 1893.

appears quite consonant with the essentials of the Christian, and perhaps also of the Jewish faith. While the critics, more especially of the Old Testament, will be reminded of the limits of their tether and their province, and (if they need it) of the wonderful and unique character of the writings which they dissect and take to pieces. This note, then, has a far narrower range. Its object is to discuss very briefly Dr. Sanday's theory of inspiration, and more especially the sense in which he thinks that the Hebrew Prophets and Scriptures were inspired.

It may seem as if my object were purely negative, and therefore useless. If I have nothing better to say than to pull down or to depreciate the bulwark which our author has raised up, it is surely not worth the saying. Dr. Sanday wishes to show that the Scriptures are inspired; do you, it may be asked, wish to show that they are not? How feeble and how unnecessary! how unlike the spirit of the great liberal churchman, whose methods and objects liberals of another creed would often do so well to follow. Surely the biography of Dean Stanley, which we have all been reading, should have prevented these few lines from being composed. But the truth is that there are so many different sorts of people to be considered, that the silence which is good to some is harmful to others. I am sure that there will be many to whom Dr. Sanday's theory of inspiration will be satisfactory and consoling. This REVIEW (especially among Jews) has an exceedingly narrow circulation; but if any such persons should happen to read this note, I hope that they will go no further. On the other hand, I feel that there may be others like myself who cannot accept our author's theory. Some of them may possibly think that the alternative lies between *this* inspiration and no inspiration. For them, or for one of them, this note may not be useless. It may suggest further reflection and further inquiry.

Dr. Sanday's opening sentence is "My subject is the Christian Bible." The title of his book is "Inspiration." Here we get immediately a close relation assumed between the Bible and Inspiration. It strikes me that this point of view is rather too narrow. I suppose a Mohammedan could write a book on Inspiration, and begin it, "My subject is the Koran." A Parsee would say, "My subject is the Avesta," and so on. We thus see that for different religions Inspiration has different books, to which it is supposed to apply. Prof. Sanday indeed says (p. 127), "The Bible is by general consent the highest expression, the most perfect document, of religion"; but it seems tolerably obvious that this is only true for those who are now, or whose ancestors were, either Christians or Jews.

On the same page, our author gives us a working definition of Inspiration. He assumes that "certain individuals were chosen to have their hearts and minds moved in a manner more penetrating and more effective than their fellows, with the result that their written words convey to us truths about the nature of God and His dealings with man which other writings do not convey with equal fulness, power and purity." This "special moving" is assumed to be "due to the action upon those hearts and minds of the Holy Spirit." And this action he calls "Inspiration."

Now, in a sense, I believe this, and in a sense I do not. It assumes that (in spite of the infinite problems of history), there is a Divine guidance of the world—a guidance for good. It assumes a "real personal will at the centre of all the infinite network of causation." With many falterings, and with a never-ending sense of the appalling difficulties involved, I do humbly believe in these assumptions to the best of my believing capacity. Now, if we believe in the first, we must also believe that the various human agencies in the development of human good (and truth about the nature of God is a part of this "good") were "chosen" for their respective tasks by God. I know that difficulties are never far away. I know that if God rules and guides, and chooses and wills, he seems to "will," or at least to "allow" the evil as well as the good. But I grasp my nettle, and though I cannot deny, and cannot explain the deduction, I refuse to let it shake my faith in the premiss. I believe then that the individuals were "chosen," chosen, that is, to convey to us (through the medium of their written words), "truths about the nature of God and his dealings with man which other writings do not convey with equal fulness, power and purity." So far as I have read the religious literature of other races, I should be willing with Dr. Sanday to apply these words to the writers of the Bible. Their words seem to me to excel the words of other great (and, as I believe) inspired teachers in "fulness, power, and purity." But Professor Sanday does not merely use the words "chosen to convey." He says chosen "to have their hearts and minds moved" to convey, and he speaks of this moving as a "special moving," and "due to the action upon those hearts and minds of the Holy Spirit." I am not sure that I am here in full agreement with Dr. Sanday. I do not know that I even understand what he means by "special moving." I do not profess to know what is the relation of the Divine Spirit to the human spirit; but the only conception of God, which I can form and maintain to my own mind, is of a God at once transcendent and immanent, who works according to immutable laws, because these laws are part of his very nature and being. I do believe in God's rule, although I do not

believe in miracles. Or rather, if you tell me that I cannot believe in God's rule, unless I believe in miracles, then I cannot believe in God's rule. Whether this is right or wrong, stupid or sensible, philosophic or arbitrary, I do not pretend to decide; but I believe that many people are in the same position as I, and many will, therefore, be liable to give up believing in inspiration if they are told that it implies a "special moving," that is a "moving" different in kind from all other "movings," that is a miraculous moving. It all depends on what you mean by the word "special." If special means merely special in degree, I assent at once. Then it can clearly be applied to the case of Socrates or Buddha or St. Francis of Assisi, and to them I personally would apply it. But I fancy that Professor Sanday would not apply it to them, and that "special" with him means something very similar to "miraculous." At the same time, he is careful to distinguish his own "inductive" theory of inspiration from the "Traditional theory." Now, I hope that those who do not feel satisfied with his inductive theory will not think that the only alternative is to reject inspiration altogether. Professor Sanday says that "the danger of the traditional view is lest inspiration should be thought of as something dead and mechanical" (page 399). I suppose this means that, in the traditional view, inspiration is something externally and mechanically superadded to the ordinary human personality. When a man wrote under "inspiration," his ordinary manhood was, as it were, suspended; "inspiration" took its place, and became the "cause" or "origin" of his words. This is clearly a miracle. The inductive view, on the other hand, regards inspiration as "something vital and organic," as a "living product which falls naturally into its place in the development of the purpose of the living God." This seems quite satisfactory, if it means that inspiration is not a miraculous process, but part and parcel of the general purpose of the ruling God. If it is vital and organic, why should we not suppose that, so far as they did and taught what was good and true, God worked in and through Plato and Mohammed in the same way as he worked in and through Obadiah and Malachi? But Professor Sanday makes me doubt whether he would accept this inference when he says that his view of inspiration as well as the traditional view, "implies a direct objective action of the Divine upon the human." I am never quite sure where I am or where I am meant to be when those dreadful words "subjective" and "objective" are brought to bear upon me. Was the action of the Divine upon the human in the case of Plato objective but indirect, or direct but subjective, or indirect *and* subjective? If, as I imagine, Dr. Sanday would say the third, we may as well drop "objective" and keep only

to "direct." But this is, I suppose, where I should part company from Dr. Sanday. If and so far as Plato and St. Francis were inspired, it appears to me that their inspiration was as "direct" as the inspiration of Amos and Obadiah.

Professor Sanday is keen upon the point that his theory of inspiration allows of differences in degree, and admits of error, imperfection and pseudonymity. The prophets were more inspired than the historians, "from the point of view of the manner of their inspiration." The inspiration of priests, psalmists and wise men "as compared with that of the prophets must be described as secondary": it is only as "judged by the value of its results" that their inspiration is "not inferior to that of the prophets themselves" (p. 397). So again he says, "there are some books (of the Bible) in which the Divine element is at the maximum, and others in which it is at the minimum" (p. 398). And also, "just as there is a descending scale within the Canon, there is an ascending scale outside it. Some of the books in our Apocrypha might well lay claim to a measure of inspiration" (p. 259). These differences in degree strike me as rather difficult to harmonise with the unity in kind. I can understand a man who says "Amos is inspired, and the 139th Psalm is inspired; the quality of their inspiration is the same." I can, I hope, understand myself when I say "Amos is inspired, the 139th Psalm is inspired, and Plato is inspired"; but I find it hard to understand when I am told that Amos is inspired in one manner, the 139th Psalm in another, that the inspiration of the one is primary, the other secondary, but that both are the result of the "direct objective action of the Divine upon the human," and both inspired in a manner in which Plato was not. I do not understand, if there is an ascending scale outside the Canon as well as a descending scale within it, why it is only "some of the books in our Apocrypha" which "might well lay claim to a measure of inspiration." Why not also the Koran? And here I come to another point, on which it will be necessary to dwell a little more fully.

Why is it that Professor Sanday thinks that "some of the books in our Apocrypha might well lay claim to a measure of inspiration"? Clearly because of their occasionally noble and true teaching in matters of morals and religion. That is to say, his test of inspiration, as in the definition on p. 127, is the quality—the moral and religious quality—of the book. Now, judged by that test, I cannot accept the view that the inspiration of the Psalter is always secondary, that of the prophets always primary. To me the 139th Psalm is more inspired than Zephaniah or Malachi just because it conveys to me "truths about the nature of God and his dealings with man," with greater "fulness, power and purity," than either of these prophecies.

The truth seems to me that, whereas in his definition Professor Sanday makes quality a test of inspiration, he elsewhere brings in, as a proof of it, divers other reasons of far more questionable validity.

The prophet is more inspired than the psalmist because he spoke in the name of God. His words, as he believed, were not his own, but God's; and this belief was, Professor Sanday thinks, both warranted and accurate. The utterances of the prophets "had a cause outside themselves, a real objective cause, not to be confused with any mental process of their own" (page 146). This I can only so far believe as it harmonises with my general view of inspiration indicated above. If it were true in a deeper, fuller sense (a sense in which Professor Sanday apparently holds it), two deductions would seem to me to follow, at least one of which is expressly repudiated by our author. In the first place, if I really believed that in some peculiar and special method God conveyed his will to those particular prophets, the "central representatives of Israel's religion, the culmination of all religion before the coming of Christ" (page 143), then I should not expect to find anything in their writings which was not perfectly true, perfectly good, and perfectly religious; but, as a matter of fact, I find divers things in these prophets which I do not hold to be perfectly true, good and religious. It is a minor difficulty, but still a real one, that I should not expect them to be interlarded with interpolations, so that sometimes the greatest of their supposed thoughts may possibly be the work of editorial interpolation (*e.g.*, Isaiah ii. 2-4, xix. 23-25), or of late and anonymous writers (*e.g.*, Isaiah xxv. 8, xxxiii. 15). In the second place, I should be compelled to believe that only those prophets were inspired, and none others; or, in other words, that if any others said that they too were inspired by God, they were either deceivers or self-deceived (*πλανῶντες* [ἡ] *πλανώμενοι*).

This is what König really does believe. He, as Professor Sanday says, "insists upon an absolute opposition between the false prophets and the true." To which it is replied, "God does not act *per saltum* in revelation any more than in nature; lower forms lead up to higher, mixed forms to pure; the special influences at work in these latter do not involve any breach of continuity" (page 141, n. 1). I do not think that this is quite consistent with what is said a few pages later:—"It is the characteristic of the false prophets to confuse the deceits of their own heart with the word of the Lord" (page 148). For if the false prophets were either entirely self-deceived, or entirely deceivers, and if the true prophets were entirely accurate and warranted in the ascription of their message to God, then it occurs to me that there was a real *saltus*, or jump, between the two orders,

and it would be improper to speak of the false prophets as representing a grade in revelation at all. I do not see how it is right to say that "the lower prophecy had its function and its place" (page 143), if it is right to speak of pure delusion and deception upon the one hand, of pure accuracy and truth upon the other. And to this opposition between the "true" and the false prophets, Professor Sanday stands, as it seems to me, committed. It is surely *only* of the canonical or true prophets that he would say that he accepts and believes their "firm and unwavering belief that they were instruments or organs of the Most High, and that the thoughts which arose in their minds about Him and His Will, and the commands and exhortations which they issued in His name, really came at His prompting, and were really invested with His authority." He even goes so far as to add, "There is no alternative between accepting this belief as true and regarding it as a product of mental disease or delusion" (page 394). In that case everybody who has acted or spoken in the name of God, with the exception of certain few individuals in the Old Testament and the New, was the victim of disease and delusion. This seems a hard saying. I am prepared to allow that the accepted prophets were deluded in one sense, though not in another. I do not believe that the "Word of the Lord" was specially revealed to Jeremiah, after ten days' waiting, by a psychological miracle. In that sense Jeremiah was deluded. But yet the words which, after the ten days' interval, seemed to Jeremiah to have been specially put in his heart by God, were good and true words, and therefore, in so far as God is the God of goodness and truth, they were words, which, in the last resort, he had intended that Jeremiah should say. The other view might suppose that Jeremiah sat perfectly listless for ten days, and waited. The view I hold is that he meditated, doubted, wrestled, and at last, perhaps suddenly, perhaps gradually, resolved and determined. This resolution and determination seemed to him the Word of God; it was such in the sense that I have described. Whether my view is less philosophical than Professor Sanday's, or whether it is a distinction without a difference, or an irrational and unreal resting-place on the road to "Naturalism," I am not theologian and philosopher enough to decide. I can only try to say honestly how the problem presents itself to me, hoping that an honest, if very imperfect statement, may be of some use to another.

I do not think that there is any value in the argument that the canonical prophets were really granted "a special access of the Divine gift" of inspiration, because the presence of it was "universally recognised by their contemporaries" (p. 149). The people believed in the inspiration of the "false" prophets as well as the

"true." However many thousands of Arabs believed in the inspiration of the Mahdi, that would not make Professor Sanday believe in it the more. It is also a curious fact that the phrase, "saith the Lord," on which our author lays such stress, is most frequently used by prophets such as Zechariah, whose inspiration seems somewhat less spontaneous and vivid than that of Amos and Isaiah. Nor do I think that I could entirely assent to our author's reasoning when he bases the truth and special quality of the prophetic inspiration upon "the difficulty of accounting for the prophetic consciousness on any other hypothesis" (p. 150). Surely there have been other people, in other races and times, who have felt driven by an irresistible force to speak an unpopular truth or to do a painful deed, and who have recognised in that force the impulse of God. "Circumstances," I suppose, did not "lead up" to the call of George Fox. You cannot in one sense account for Amos any more than you can account for Socrates; but I do not feel that we are driven to assume more intention and special impulse from the omniscient and ruling God in the one case than in the other. Professor Sanday says that the creed of Israel was plainly "no natural product, but rather one that went against nature; bestowed from without, and not generated from within" (p. 151). This seems to me rather too strongly stated. If it were perfectly accurate, could the inspiration which brought about this product be rightly described as "vital and organic," or its work—at least in certain spheres—be rightly described as coming "through avowedly human channels and by human and natural processes"? (p. 183.) I am not sure whether we had not better be content with those words of Kuenen, quoted by Professor Sanday, "In the fortunes and developments of nations, and not least clearly [a litotes, I should imagine] in those of Israel, we see Him, the holy and all-wise Instructor of his human children." Professor Sanday says that the teaching of the prophets was "not such as could have been arrived at by any of the ordinary methods current then or even by any of those which are current now. A perfectly just and holy and good God is not the result of any induction." He calls it, and I agree with him, "a splendid venture of faith" "shot through the gloom and tangle of existence" at the "instance and motion" of God (p. 152). I agree again; but as I find in Plato the conception of a perfectly just and holy and good God, it seems to me that the same "instance and motion" produced the effect in the one case as in the other.

We seem to come back to the test of the original definition, namely, that of intrinsic excellence and originality. It is because of insufficient excellence and originality that Professor Sanday refuses

the title of prophet to Ruskin and Carlyle (p. 166). And he is, I think, quite warranted in doing so. Mrs. Browning said: "And my Plato, the divine one, if men know the gods aright"; but even Plato does not bring out the lovingkindness of God; and so far as my limited reading goes, I agree with Professor Sanday when he says: "On the greatest points of all, those which relate to the character and attributes of God, the Bible is not only supreme but unique. The believer in the Bible has no need to exaggerate; he has but to state the facts as they really are" (p. 167). Whether we are dealing with prophets or with psalmists, with the Bible or not with the Bible, we have, I think, in measuring the inspiration of any book, only one question to ask, namely, Whether (in the words of Professor Sanday as regards the work of the Hebrew priests and the ceremonial law) "it is such a product as is worthy to have come from God—to have come from Him, that is, in the way in which other forms of revelation have come from Him, through avowedly human channels and by human and natural processes, yet with an impulse and guidance communicated to those processes by the Holy Spirit" (p. 183). In the sense in which God, as ruler of the world, communicates his spirit to those who build up his human work of goodness and truth, I would accept that statement in its entirety.

Prof. Sanday does not seem to me to consider the question as to what kind and measure of inspiration should be allowed to such persons as Buddha, Mohammed, or Plato, quite sufficiently. He says, "we do not deny a Divine guiding in other races. Not wholly in the dark did men of other nationality grope after an object of worship and of praise" (p. 126). And again: "In claiming for the Bible Inspiration we do not exclude the possibility of other lower or more partial degrees of inspiration in other literatures" (p. 128). And lastly, "It must not be thought that God is present only in a single creed, and that all others alike are destitute of Him. It is rather His method to lead men gradually, and sometimes by circuitous routes, to the better understanding of Himself" (p. 395). I cannot help feeling that these quotations might logically lead to a more comprehensive and equitable view of inspiration, such as I have here attempted to convey. If for example it be true that at least in our ethics we owe a great deal to the Greeks, and if goodness be divine, it may surely be said that a number of Greek books "convey to us truths" about the nature of goodness, which "other writings do not convey to us with equal fulness, power and purity." And if so, I should scarcely hesitate to add that their words are in the last resort due to the purposed action of God's Holy Spirit, and that we may "call that action Inspiration.'

In the history of the Greeks, and I would humbly seek to believe, in the history of England, we may be right in feeling that "there is something more than the individual minds at work : they are subsumed, as it were, in the operation of a larger Mind, that central Intelligence which directs and gives unity and purpose to the scattered movements and driftings of men " (p. 402).

I trust that there may be some for whom the suggestions here thrown out may not have been destructive but reconciling. There may be some who have been told (I am not thinking here of Professor Sanday, and not referring to his book), "either the Bible is inspired or it is a deception, either the Bible is inspired or it is a mere compilation of man"; and when they ask what "inspired" means, they will be told that it means something which is exceptional and irregular. They are informed that inspirations differ in kind, and that the inspiration of the Bible differs in kind from every other inspiration : that its inspiration, though not "mechanical," is at least "objective," and though "organic" is yet miraculous. If this be the meaning of the word "inspired," and this its connotation, they may feel bound to believe that the Bible is either a deception on the one hand, or a mere compilation of man upon the other. It is then to preserve inspiration in one sense, that I am fain to deny it in another. In order to keep my hold upon the Divine elements of the Bible, I seek to show that they must be sought for there in the same way and by the same tests that we seek for them elsewhere. To affirm and to maintain the Divine foundation and the Divine intent in every word and work of truth and love, we are bound, as I believe, to deny a unique and miraculous manifestation of God in a single race and at a particular time.

Returning for a last moment, and for another reason, to Professor Sanday's book, may I take this opportunity of saying how grateful I am to him for the more than generous manner in which he has there referred to my own small contribution to Old Testament criticism? When he is kind enough to say that his one complaint against me is that I follow some of my authorities too closely, I am quite conscious that this complaint, which has just been echoed in a form more trenchant by Professor Budde, is very well deserved. But the problems of the Hebrew Scriptures are so numerous and manifold that an independent facing of them needs not only the familiarity of long continued study, but a certain amount of determination and intrepidity. Having, if I may use the plural, once chosen your nursing mothers, you are only too ready to remain tied to their apron-strings.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

January 21st, 1894.